



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/710,214

11/10/2000

Walter R. Bodwell

BMC1100-1

4602

25094

7590

06/09/2004

GRAY, CARY, WARE & FREIDENRICH LLP  
1221 SOUTH MOPAC EXPRESSWAY  
SUITE 400  
AUSTIN, TX 78746-6875

EXAMINER

LAZARO, DAVID R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2155

DATE MAILED: 06/09/2004

11

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/710,214

Applicant(s)

BODWELL ET AL.

Examiner

David Lazaro

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 December 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 January 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5.7.8.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-37 are pending in this Office Action.

***Papers Received***

2. Declaration and Power of Attorney received 03/01/01.
3. Letter to Draftsman and Formal Drawings received 01/12/01.
4. Change of Address received 05/03/01.
5. Correction of Small Entity Status received 12/27/02.

***Priority***

6. This application claims the benefit of 60/165,102 filed 11/12/1999.

***Information Disclosure Statement***

7. The information disclosure statements (IDS) submitted on 03/05/01-Paper #5, 09/06/01-Paper #7 and 11/12/02-Paper #8 have been considered by the examiner.

***Claim Objections***

8. Claim 37 is objected to because of the following informalities: "will not be cached" should be "is not cached" for consistency with Claim 35. Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

10. Claims 1-8, 14-21, 27, 28, 30-32, 34, 35 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,185,598 by Farber et al. (Farber).

11. With respect to Claim 1, Farber teaches a method for mediating a web page at an intermediate server (Col. 8 line 54 – Col. 9 line 8) comprising: retrieving the web page from a target web server (Col. 8 line 54-66); ensuring that the web page will not be cached (Col. 23 lines 5-11); and changing a dynamic link in the web page to refer to the intermediate server (Col. 16 lines 51-65).

12. With respect to Claim 2, Farber teaches all the limitations of Claim 1 and further teaches wherein the dynamic link is a relative link, and the step of changing a relative

Art Unit: 2155

link in the web page further comprises: if the relative link contains a base tag, modifying the base tag to refer to the intermediate server (Col. 16 lines 51-65); and if the relative link does not contain the base tag, inserting a reference base tag, wherein the reference base tag refers to the intermediate server (Col. 16 lines 51-65).

13. With respect to Claim 3, Farber teaches all the limitations of Claim 1 and further teaches wherein the step of ensuring the web page will not be cached comprises setting the web page to expire immediately (Col. 23 lines 5-11).

14. With respect to Claim 4, Farber teaches all the limitations of Claim 1 and further teaches the dynamic link is an absolute URL, and further comprising identifying the absolute URL by a protocol (Col. 16 line 51 – Col. 17 line 23 and Col. 6 lines 16-35).

15. With respect to Claim 5, Farber teaches all the limitations of Claim 1 and further teaches the step of changing a dynamic link to the intermediate server further comprises using a host name to define the target web server associated with the web page (Col. 9 lines 45-65).

16. With respect to Claim 6, Farber teaches all the limitations of Claim 1 and further teaches the step of changing a dynamic link to refer to the intermediate server further comprises using a port to define the target web server associated with the web page (Col. 7 lines 37-46).

17. With respect to Claim 7, Farber teaches all the limitations of Claim 1 and further teaches identifying a resource type according to a resource source tag in the web page; and marking the resource type (Col. 16 line 66 – Col. 17 line 5).

18. With respect to Claim 8 Farber teaches all the limitations of Claim 1 and further teaches changing a document.domain script command to refer to a domain for the intermediate server (Col 16 line 52- Col. 17 line 5).

19. With respect to Claim 14, Farber teaches a system for mediating a web page at an intermediate server (Col. 8 line 54 – Col. 9 line 8) comprising: a computer readable medium; and software instructions stored on the computer readable medium, wherein the software instructions are operable to: retrieve the web page from a target web server (Col. 8 line 54-66); ensure that the web page will not be cached (Col. 23 lines 5-11); and change a dynamic link in the web page to refer to the intermediate server (Col. 16 lines 51-65).

20. With respect to Claim 15, Farber teaches all the limitations of Claim 14 and further teaches the software instructions are further operable to ensure that the web page will not be cached comprises setting the web page to expire immediately (Col. 23 lines 5-11).

21. With respect to Claim 16, Farber teaches all the limitations of Claim 14 and further teaches wherein the dynamic link is a relative link, and wherein the software instructions are further operable to: if the relative link contains a base tag, modify the base tag to refer to the intermediate server (Col. 16 lines 51-65); and if the relative link does not contain the base tag, insert a reference base tag, wherein the reference base tag refers to the intermediate server (Col. 16 lines 51-65).

22. With respect to Claim 17, Farber teaches all the limitations of Claim 14 and further teaches the software instructions are further operable to use a host name to define the target web server associated with the web page (Col. 9 lines 45-65).
23. With respect to Claim 18, Farber teaches all the limitations of Claim 14 and further teaches the software instructions are further operable to use a port to define the target web server associated with the web page (Col. 7 lines 37-46).
24. With respect to Claim 19, Farber teaches all the limitations of Claim 14 and further teaches the dynamic link is an absolute URL, and the software instructions are further operable to identify the absolute URL by a protocol (Col. 16 line 51 – Col. 17 line 23 and Col. 6 lines 16-35).
25. With respect to Claim 20, Farber teaches all the limitations of Claim 14 and further teaches the software instructions are further operable to: identify a resource type according to a resource source tag in the web page; and mark the resource type (Col. 16 line 66 – Col. 17 line 5).
26. With respect to Claim 21 Farber teaches all the limitations of Claim 14 and further teaches the software instructions are further operable to: change a document.domain script command to refer to a domain for the intermediate server (Col. 16 line 52- Col. 17 line 5).
27. With respect to Claim 27, Farber teaches a method for mediating a web page at an intermediate server (Col. 8 line 54 – Col. 9 line 8) comprising: retrieving the web page from a target web server (Col. 8 line 54-66); ensuring that the web page will not be cached (Col. 23 lines 5-11); identifying an absolute URL by a protocol (Col. 16 line 51 –

Col. 17 line 23 and Col. 6 lines 16-35); and changing the absolute URL to refer to the intermediate server (Col. 16 line 51 – Col. 17 line 23).

28. With respect to Claim 28, Farber teaches all the limitations of Claim 27 and further teaches changing a relative URL in the web page to refer to the intermediate server (Col. 16 lines 51-65).

29. With respect to Claim 30, Farber teaches all the limitations of Claim 27 and further teaches the step of ensuring the web page will not be cached comprises setting the web page to expire immediately (Col. 23 lines 5-11).

30. With respect to Claim 31, Farber teaches a method for mediating a web page at an intermediate server (Col. 8 line 54 – Col. 9 line 8) comprising: retrieving the web page from a target web server (Col. 8 line 54-66); ensuring that the web page will not be cached (Col. 23 lines 5-11); and changing a relative link in the web page to refer to the intermediate server, further comprising: if the relative link contains a base tag, modify the base tag to refer to the intermediate server (Col. 16 lines 51-65); and if the relative link does not contain the base tag, insert a reference base tag, wherein the reference base tag refers to the intermediate server (Col. 16 lines 51-65).

31. With respect to Claim 32, Farber teaches all the limitations of Claim 31 and further teaches changing an absolute URL in the web page to refer to the intermediate server (Col. 16 line 51 – Col. 17 line 23 and Col. 6 lines 16-35).

32. With respect to Claim 34, Farber teaches all the limitations of Claim 31 and further teaches the step of ensuring the web page will not be cached comprises setting the web page to expire immediately (Col. 23 lines 5-11).



33. With respect to Claim 35, Farber teaches a method for mediating a web page at an intermediate server (Col. 8 line 54 – Col. 9 line 8) comprising: retrieving the web page from a target web server (Col. 8 line 54-66); ensuring that the web page is not cached (Col. 23 lines 5-11); and changing an absolute link in the web page to refer to the intermediate server (Col. 16 line 51 – Col. 17 line 23 and Col. 6 lines 16-35); and changing a relative link in the web page to refer to the intermediate server (Col. 16 lines 51-65).

34. With respect to Claim 37, Farber teaches all the limitations of Claim 35 and further teaches the step of ensuring the web page will not be cached comprises setting the web page to expire immediately (Col. 23 lines 5-11).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

35. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

36. Claims 9 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farber in view of U.S. Patent 6,021,435 by Nielsen.

37. With respect to Claim 9, Farber teaches some types of links may possibly be unsupported (Col. 17 lines 28-36). Farber does not explicitly disclose an the use of an error message. Nielsen teaches using an error message (Col. 1 line 66 – Col. 2 line 6). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to take the method disclosed by Farber and modify it as indicated by Nielsen such that the method further comprises replacing an unsupported link with an error message. One would be motivated to have this as it increases the efficiency of user browsing (Col. 1 lines 45-50 of Nielsen).

38. With respect to Claim 22, Farber teaches some types of links may possibly be unsupported (Col. 17 lines 28-36). Farber does not explicitly disclose an the use of an error message. Nielsen teaches using an error message (Col. 1 line 66 – Col. 2 line 6). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the system disclosed by Farber and modify it as indicated by Nielsen such that the system further comprises software instructions which are further operable to replace an unsupported link with an error message. One would be motivated to have this as it increases the efficiency of user browsing (Col. 1 lines 45-50 of Nielsen).

39. Claims 10, 11, 23, 24, 29, 33 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farber in view of U.S. Patent 6,510,462 by Blumenau (Blumenau).

40. With respect to Claim 10, Farber teaches all the limitations of Claim 1 but does not explicitly disclose recording a set of creation details for a first cookie. Blumenau teaches recording a set of creation details for a first cookie (Col. 5 lines 60-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the method disclosed by Farber and modify it as indicated by Blumenau such that the method further comprises recording a set of creation details for a first cookie.

One would be motivated to have this as it enables accurate tracking of web usage (Col. 2 lines 21-23 and Col. 5 line 60 – Col. 6 line 3 of Blumenau).

41. With respect to Claim 11, Farber in view of Blumenau teaches all the limitations of Claim 10 and further teaches the set of creation details is recorded from an http-header (Col. 5 lines 60-67 of Blumenau).

42. With respect to Claim 23, Farber teaches all the limitations of Claim 22 but does not explicitly disclose recording a set of creation details for a first cookie. Blumenau teaches recording a set of creation details for a first cookie (Col. 5 lines 60-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the system disclosed by Farber and modify it as indicated by Blumenau such that the system further comprises software instructions further operable to record a set of creation details for a first cookie. One would be motivated to have this as it enables accurate tracking of web usage (Col. 2 lines 21-23 and Col. 5 line 60 – Col. 6 line 3 of Blumenau).

43. With respect to Claim 24, Farber in view of Blumenau teaches all the limitations of Claim 23 and further teaches software instructions further operable to record the set of creation details from an http-header (Col. 5 lines 60-67 of Blumenau).

44. With respect to Claim 29, Farber teaches all the limitations of Claim 27 but does not explicitly disclose recording a set of creation details for a first cookie. Blumenau teaches recording a set of creation details for a first cookie (Col. 5 lines 60-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the method disclosed by Farber and modify it as indicated by Blumenau such

that the method further comprises recording a set of creation details for a first cookie.

One would be motivated to have this as it enables accurate tracking of web usage (Col. 2 lines 21-23 and Col. 5 line 60 – Col. 6 line 3 of Blumenau).

45. With respect to Claim 33, Farber teaches all the limitations of Claim 31 but does not explicitly disclose recording a set of creation details for a first cookie. Blumenau teaches recording a set of creation details for a first cookie (Col. 5 lines 60-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the method disclosed by Farber and modify it as indicated by Blumenau such that the method further comprises recording a set of creation details for a first cookie. One would be motivated to have this as it enables accurate tracking of web usage (Col. 2 lines 21-23 and Col. 5 line 60 – Col. 6 line 3 of Blumenau).

46. With respect to Claim 36, Farber teaches all the limitations of Claim 35 but does not explicitly disclose recording a set of creation details for a first cookie. Blumenau teaches recording a set of creation details for a first cookie (Col. 5 lines 60-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the method disclosed by Farber and modify it as indicated by Blumenau such that the method further comprises recording a set of creation details for a first cookie. One would be motivated to have this as it enables accurate tracking of web usage (Col. 2 lines 21-23 and Col. 5 line 60 – Col. 6 line 3 of Blumenau).

Art Unit: 2155

47. Claims 12 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farber in view of Blumenau as applied to claims 23 and 10 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,948,061 by Merriman et al. (Merriman).

48. With respect to Claim 12, Farber in view of Blumenau teaches all the limitations of Claim 10 and further teaches includes a set of creation details of a first cookie (Col. 5 lines 60-67 of Blumenau), but does not explicitly disclose causing a browser to send a second cookie to the intermediate server. Merriman teaches causing a browser to send a second cookie to an intermediate server (Col. 3 lines 41-47). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the method disclosed by Farber in view of Blumenau and modify it as indicated by Merriman such that the method further comprises causing a browser to send a second cookie to the intermediate web server, wherein the second cookie includes the set of creation details for the first cookie. One would be motivated to have this as there is need to gather information about users (Col. 2 lines 1-3 of Merriman).

49. With respect to Claim 25, Farber in view of Blumenau teaches all the limitations of Claim 14 and further teaches includes a set of creation details of a first cookie (Col. 5 lines 60-67 of Blumenau), but does not explicitly disclose causing a browser to send a second cookie to the intermediate server. Merriman teaches causing a browser to send a second cookie to an intermediate server (Col. 3 lines 41-47). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the system disclosed by Farber in view of Blumenau and modify it as indicated by Merriman such that the system further comprises software instructions further operable to cause a

Art Unit: 2155

browser to send a second cookie to the intermediate web server, wherein the second cookie includes the set of creation details for the first cookie. One would be motivated to have this as there is need to gather information about users (Col. 2 lines 1-3 of Merriman).

50. Claim 13 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farber in view of "HTML: The Definitive Guide, Third Edition" by Musciano et al.

(Musciano).

51. With respect to Claim 13, Farber teaches all the limitations of Claim 1 but does not explicitly disclose changing a form GET submission to a form POST submission. Musciano teaches that a form POST submission can be used instead of a form GET submission when both POST and GET are supported (Page 326, section 10.2.4.1 'POST or GET?'). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the method disclosed by Farber and modify it as indicated by Musciano such that the method further comprises changing a form GET submission to a form POST submission. One would be motivated to have this as it would enhance the system by allowing servers with form processing limitations to handle forms with numerous fields or long text fields (Page 326, section 10.2.4.1 'POST or GET?').

52. With respect to Claim 26, Farber teaches all the limitations of Claim 14 but does not explicitly disclose changing a form GET submission to a form POST submission. Musciano teaches that a form POST submission can be used instead of a form GET

submission when both POST and GET are supported (Page 326, section 10.2.4.1 'POST or GET?'). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the system disclosed by Farber and modify it as indicated by Musciano such that the system further comprises software instructions which are further operable to change a form GET submission to a form POST submission. One would be motivated to have this as it would enhance the system by allowing servers with form processing limitations to handle forms with numerous fields or long text fields (Page 326, section 10.2.4.1 'POST or GET?').

### ***Conclusion***

53. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

54. U.S. Patent 5,835,718 by Blewett "URL rewriting pseudo proxy server" November 10, 1998. Discloses tracking of user interaction by rewriting URLs on the fly.

55. U.S. Patent 6,052,730 by Felciano et al. "Method for monitoring and/or modifying web browsing sessions" April 18, 2000. Discloses an intermediate server that utilizes a CGI script to modify URLs such that they point to the intermediate server for use in monitoring web browsing activities.


56. U.S. Patent 6,356,934 by Delph "Intermediate server having control program for storing content accessed during browsing sessions and playback program for asynchronously replaying browsing sessions." March 12, 2002. Discloses modification of URLs to point back to the intermediate server.


57. U.S. Patent 6,401,077 by Godden et al. "Method and system for providing additional behavior through a web page" June 4, 2002. Discloses the use of a portal server that redirects navigational URLs in each web page back through the portal server.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Lazaro whose telephone number is 703-305-4868. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on 703-308-6662. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
David Lazaro  
June 8, 2004

  
**HOSAIN ALAM**  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER